REMARKS

Claims 1-25 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 16, 17 and 19-25 are amended. No claims are added or canceled in this response. Claims 1-25 remain pending.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-6 and 8-25

Claims 1-6 and 8-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Czerwinski et al. (An Architecture for a Secure Service Discovery Services, ACM, 1999) (hereinafter "Czerwinski"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Generally, the presently claimed subject matter is concerned with object-exchange protocol. At least one method is described for an object-exchange client device to discover the availability of object-exchange resources on a network.

It is noted that a basic rationale for the amendments herein is to replace the term "OBEX" for "object-exchange". The term "OBEX" more clearly implies that the object-exchange protocol is a named, defined protocol in contrast to the term "object-exchange", which may imply a generically defined protocol. The OBEX protocol is described at length in the specification of the present application and is a protocol well known in the art.

Other amendments have been made to address the Office's concerns pointed out in the Office Action that "it is noted that the features upon which

applicant relies...are not recited in the rejected claims." Although Applicant disagrees with this statement and contends that object exchange devices and protocols were recited numerous times in many claims, an attempt has been made to clarify the claims and the specificity of the claims to object-exchange protocol and devices.

The object-exchange (OBEX) protocol is a compact, efficient, binary protocol that enables a wide range of devices to exchange data in a simple and spontaneous manner. OBEX is designed to interconnect the full range of devices (PCs, pagers, mobile phones, printers, etc.) that support portable protocols, such as IrDA (Infrared Data Association), Bluetooth, etc.

Object-exchange devices, such as an object-exchange server and an object-exchange client, use OBEX protocols to transfer "objects" among themselves. For this purpose, "objects" are defined as sets of digital data. Object-exchange protocols are unconcerned with specific syntax and semantics of the objects being transferred between OBEX devices. Furthermore, OBEX objects may be exchanged over any type of communications medium.

Traditionally, devices utilizing an IrDA or Bluetooth communications protocol are limited to discovering network devices available to them only if the network devices use the same protocol. Most network resources utilize IP (Internet Protocol) to communicate with devices that utilize the resources. The present invention provides OBEX protocols that allow IrDA and/or Bluetooth devices to discover IP network resources.

Czerwinski describes systems and methods for a secure service discovery service (SDS). Network service providers use the SDS to advertise complex

descriptions of available or already running services, while clients use the SDS to compose complex queries for locating these services.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a method for "an OBEX client to discover an accessible OBEX resource on a network incorporating routable communications protocols." The method comprises steps of "listening on a multicast channel provided according to a routable network communications protocol for an identification advertisement from an OBEX device," "receiving at least one advertisement on the multicast channel identifying an accessible OBEX resource" and "storing information from the received advertisement." The method further comprises the step of "using the stored information to address the identified OBEX device."

The emphasis on the term "OBEX" above points out the focus of claim 1 on object-exchange (OBEX) resources. Implementing an OBEX discovery service solves a different problem not disclosed or anticipated by Czerwinski. Czerwinski describes a system such as is well known in the art - a service discovery system. Introducing IrDA and/or Bluetooth devices into a system as described by Czerwinski would not provide a service that would allow such devices to discover IP resources available for use by the devices.

The restriction of claim 1 to OBEX devices and protocol is not disclosed or anticipated by Czerwinski. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-15

Claims 2-15 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Accordingly, the rejections of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claim 16

Claim 16 recites a computer-readable medium having instructions for performing "a method for an OBEX client to discover an accessible OBEX resource on a network incorporating routable communications protocols." The method comprises "listening on a multicast channel provided according to a routable network communications protocol for an OBEX resource identification advertisement," "receiving at least one advertisement on the multicast channel identifying an accessible OBEX resource," "storing information from the received advertisement" and "using the stored information to access the identified OBEX resource."

Similar to claim 1, claim 16 is restricted to OBEX devices and protocols. Czerwinski does not disclose or anticipate object-exchange devices or protocols used in conjunction with a device discovery service.

Accordingly, claim 16 is allowable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 17

Claim 17 recites a "method for an OBEX resource to make its accessibility known." The method includes "formulating an OBEX resource identification advertisement" and "sending the advertisement on a multicast channel provided according to a routable network communications protocol."

Claim 17 is also limited to OBEX resources, similar to claims 1 and 16. Claim 17 requires sending an object-exchange resource identification advertisement over a network according to a routable network communications protocol (e.g. IP).

Czerwinski does not discuss object-exchange models, especially advertising object-exchange resources over a routable network. As such, Czerwinski does not disclose or anticipate the elements recited in claim 17.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn.

Claims 18-24

Claim 18-24 depend from claim 17 and are allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Therefore, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claim 25

Claims 25 recites a computer-readable medium containing instructions that, when executed, perform a method "for an OBEX resource to make its accessibility known." The method comprises the steps of "formulating an OBEX resource identification advertisement" and "sending the advertisement on a multicast channel provided according to a routable network communications protocol." (Emphasis added).

Claims 25 is similar to claim 17 and requires that an advertising entity be an object-exchange entity. Furthermore, the OBEX resource advertisement is sent over a multicast channel according to a routable network protocol, such as IP.

As previously discussed, Czerwinski does not deal with object-exchange devices and/or objects advertising resources over a routable network.

Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable over the cited reference and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claim 7

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Czerwinski in view of Megowan et al. (Object Exchange Protocol by Pat Megowan, version 1.2, January 1999). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and is allowable at least by virtue of that dependency. Megowan is cited for disclosing an "inbox service" and a "file browser." The addition of an inbox service and a file browser does not overcome the shortcomings of the rejections cited in the response to the rejection of claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 7 is allowable over the cited combination of references for at least this reason and the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: December 7, 2005

By: _____

James R. Banowsky, Reg. No.: 37,773
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 705-3539
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

December 7, 2005
Date

_____
Signature

Noemi Tovar
Type or Print Name

Type of Response: RCE
Application Number: 09/872,222
Attorney Docket Number: 155612.03
Filing Date: 06/01/2004